

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 11-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 8, 13, 17, 18-20 and 23 have been amended. Claims 1 and 17 are independent claims.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1-3, 8, 11-13, 15-21 and 23-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed background art in view of Farrell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,247,675). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that the subject matter relied upon by the Examiner as admitted prior art has not been admitted by Applicants as qualifying under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, this rejection is improper.

Further, even if the subject matter of Applicants own patent application relied upon by the Examiner as being prior art did qualify under 35 U.S.C. § 102, Applicants submit that this rejection would still be improper and should be withdrawn.

For example, Applicants submit that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the unique combination of limitations of the claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

For example, with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the combination of limitations of the claimed invention, including the feature(s) of: "each of said tasks calling a kernel system function for ~~of~~ receiving an event with respect to one event under the multi-tasking environment; and blocking each of said tasks and inserting each of said tasks into a waiting-list for the event in priority order when no event is provided to the tasks, *wherein all of said tasks are queued and prioritized within said waiting-list for the event*" (emphasis added). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 17, Applicants submit that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the combination of limitations of the claimed invention, including the feature(s) of: "each of said tasks calling a kernel system function ~~of~~ for receiving an event with respect to one event in the multi-tasking environment; and blocking execution of each of the tasks and inserting each of the tasks into a waiting-list for the event according to a priority order when no event is provided to the tasks, *wherein all of said tasks are queued and prioritized within said waiting-list for the event*" (emphasis added). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Examiner has not articulated any evidence in the record of the present application that teaches or suggests the above-identified features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Applicant argued that it is improper to equate Farrell's run list to Applicant's waiting-list of the *event* because Farrell's run list queues therein only those threads with the highest priority from each dispatch class. In contrast, Applicant's waiting-list of the event stores therein all the tasks (and not just the highest priority tasks) when no event is provided to the tasks.

It is the Examiner's previous position Farrell describes that "in order to run, the run list queues only the highest priority order tasks of all the tasks from each dispatch class; but it stores all the tasks (each dispatch class (DCD) [and] also identifies high and low pointers which point to the highest and lowest priority threads with the dispatch class." However, Farrell's run list *does not* store or queue all the tasks from each dispatch class. Farrell, including the specific portions cited by the Examiner, clearly do not disclose that its run list queues all the tasks from each dispatch class. Farrell clearly emphasizes that only the highest priority thread from each dispatch class is queued on the run list 32 for execution (e.g., see column 4, lines 40-42; Abstract). This is clearly different than the claimed invention of claims 1 and 17. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Specifically, when a Thread Create function 15 is called to create each thread in Farrell, a thread having the structure as shown in Fig. 2 is created and stored in the system. This structure identifies the priority level of the task. However, the run list 32 does not store all the threads created and stored in the system, but only stores the highest priority thread from each dispatch class. As such, Farrell nowhere discloses inserting each of the tasks into a waiting-list of the event in priority order when no event is provided to the tasks, as in Applicant's claimed invention. In fact, Farrell does not disclose "a waiting-list of the event" and Farrell's run list for storing only the highest priority tasks cannot be equated to Applicant's waiting-list of the event. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

As to the dependent claims, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable due to their dependence upon an allowable independent claim and for the additional limitations provided therein.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of the rejections of record, and earnestly solicits an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Response After Final Rejection in that it reduces the issues for appeal.

Applicant respectfully petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and § 1.17 for a two-month extension of time in which to respond to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of **\$420.00** is attached to the Request for Continued Examination filed concurrently herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Matthew T. Shanley (Registration No. 47,074) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Joseph A. Kolasch, #22,463

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22032-0747

(703) 205-8000


JAK/MTS/cl